

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Tyler Sebastian Haway,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 0:14-534-TMC
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Ralph Evans; Rick Clark; Mary Hammond;	)	
Drew Sisco; Katherine Vissage; Pickens	)	
County Law Enforcement Center,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
<hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>	)	

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that Plaintiff’s motion for voluntary dismissal (ECF No. 66) be granted and this action dismissed without prejudice and that the remaining motions (ECF Nos. 50 and 57) be terminated. (ECF No. 69). The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 69 at 3). No objections have been filed to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 69). Therefore, Plaintiff’s Motion for Voluntary Dismissal (ECF No. 66) is **GRANTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. Further, Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment (ECF Nos. 50 and 57)) are **TERMINATED** as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Court Judge

March 3, 2015  
Anderson, South Carolina

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.